

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of June 2, 2003 (Office Action). As this amendment is timely filed within the three month shortened statutory period, no fee is necessary.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the title of the invention has been objected to for not being sufficiently descriptive. The Applicants have amended the title to read "METHOD, SYSTEM, AND APPARATUS FOR LIMITING AVAILABLE SELECTIONS IN A SPEECH RECOGNITION SYSTEM", which Applicants believe to be descriptive of the present invention.

In paragraph 2, claims 1, 6, and 9 have been objected to because while "speech recognition" is recited, the claimed user input is not said to be "spoken". The Applicants note that the present invention can receive any of a variety of different inputs, which can include, speech, text, pointer movements, pointer selections, and/or the like. See pages 9-10 and page 15, line 13 – page 16, line 5. These inputs are used to limit the possible selections of the speech recognition system to a particular set of selections, so that when a speech input is received, that speech input is matched to a selection within the limited set of selections.

As such, steps (a), (b), and (c) do not specifically state that a speech input is received because the input need not be a speech input. The input specified in the matching step is recited as a speech input as this is the input that is matched with the limited set of available selections. Accordingly, the Applicants do not believe that any correction is necessary.

In paragraphs 3 and 4, claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,172 to Baker *et al.* (Baker). In paragraph 5, claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, and 12.

In response, the Applicants submit herewith, executed declarations under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 (Declarations) executed by the inventors of the above-identified application. As stated in the Declarations, the Applicants conceived of the present invention at least as early as August 18, 1999, and exercised reasonable due diligence

toward the completion of the claimed invention from that date through the period ending January 26, 2001, the filing date of the above-identified application. In support of the Declarations, the Applicants also submit a copy of their Invention Disclosure evidencing conception of the above-identified invention at least as early as August 18, 1999, thus predating and overcoming Baker.

In view of the Declarations submitted herewith, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) reference with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, and 12, and the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 13 is respectfully requested.

The Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/2/03



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Kevin T. Cuenot, Registration No. 46,283
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000